of the Archives for some time. I have made this point belove in commetcion. with the 544 Camp pamer at; I do not think that a cleir of exemption from disclosure unior that section and law constitutes an admission that there is a continuing invest gathon. I such claim is made for Oswald material, I would argue that it is only accident that the material did not become part of the Commission's e disive files (they dend dend that) and hence that loss restrictive guidelines staild apply. My spect for certain FBI records on Oswald (made last July) is

You: 3/29: the core of the DeBrueys report which I sent you, with transmittal still completely on ... sward. letter, I from the state that the Commission I have no proof that the Commission it from the first that asked the FBI questions about it (CE 833). It may be apportant the this report was not in the FBI headquarters file (CE 834). It

may be important the the life the 26 volumes that the antepsy was not performed to Nichols' letter of 6/2 to your he notes that the antepsy was not performed to Nichols' letter of 6/2 to your he notes that the antepsy was not performed to